

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al. (USP 5,493,430) in view of newly cited Kuroda (5,648,197).

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al. (USP 5,493,430) and Kuroda (5,648,197), and further in view of Fukuchi et al. (USP 5,645,901).

Analysis

Turning to claim 1, a liquid-crystal display device comprises a liquid-crystal panel. The panel includes a backside substrate, a visual side substrate, and a reflection type liquid-crystal layer between the visual side and backside substrates. The backside substrate is constituted by a colored resin substrate having an electrode. Thus, the substrate itself is colored for absorbing light. This structure provide a thinner and more lightweight device than the prior art.

Lu discloses a colored layer 18 formed on the inside of the substrate 12 of a liquid crystal display. Thus, the colored layer 18 is provided separately from the substrate 12. In addition, the colored layer 18 is intended to act as a reflecting layer (col. 3, lines 60-65, "...so that light incident on the display will pass through the electrode layer 20 and reflect off the back paint layer 18."). Thus, Lu is directed to a backside substrate which reflects rather than absorbs light.

Kuroda discloses a colored substrate 12 for an optical disk. Kuroda is not directed to a liquid-crystal display device as in Lu. Given these two completely different devices, one would not have thought to turn to Kuroda for modifying Lu. Thus, it would not have been obvious to combine Lu and Kuroda.

In addition, even if one were to think to combine these two references, the alleged backside substrate in Lu *reflects* light (see above), whereas the colored substrate 12 in Kuroda

absorbs light. Thus, there is no reason one of ordinary skill in the art would have employed the light-absorbing colored substrate 12 of Kuroda instead of the light-reflecting colored layer 18 and substrate 12 of Lu since this would change the operability of the device in Lu. See MPEP §2143.02.

For at least the foregoing reasons, one would not have been motivated to modify Lu in view of Kuroda to arrive at the invention according to claim 1.

Claim 2 is directed to the backside substrate which comprises the colored resin substrate and transparent electrically conductive film. The rejection of claim 2 based on the combination of Lu and Kuroda is deficient for similar reasons to those mentioned above regarding claim 1. First, one would not have thought to modify Lu in view of Kuroda since Kuroda is directed to an optical disk rather than a liquid-crystal display device. Second, even if one were to have looked to Kuroda for teachings to improve upon Lu, one would not have been motivated to use the light-*absorbing* substrate 12 of Kuroda instead of the light-*reflecting* colored layer 18 and substrate 12 of Lu because this would change the principle of operation of the device in Lu.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 2, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/782,201

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

Attorney Docket No.: Q63077